

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Final Office Action dated February 19, 2008, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on May 19, 2008. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-11, 14-18, 20-23 and 26-30 are pending in the application. Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-11, 14-16 and 28-30 remain pending following entry of this response. Claims 17-27 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 6, 11, and 28 have been amended. Applicants submit that the amendments do not introduce new matter. Further, Applicants submit that the amendments should not require further consideration on behalf of the Examiner, as the amendments modify an existing limitation expressed in the alternative to be expressed in the conjunctive.

Further, Applicants are not conceding in this application that the amended (or canceled) claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the claimed subject matter. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these (pre-amended or canceled claims) and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4, 6-7, 9-11, 14-18, 20-23, 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by, *Goiffon et al.* (US 6,453,312 B1), hereinafter "*Goiffon*". Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9

USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

In this case, *Goiffon* does not disclose “each and every element as set forth in the claim.” For example, *Goiffon* does not disclose a “method for context-sensitive searching of fields of a data repository using multiple levels of term expansion” that includes a step of “obtaining one or more parameters associated with the base search term.” In particular, *Goiffon* does not disclose a method where the one or more parameters include “at least a credential associated with the user and a role associated with the user,” as recited by claim 1. Similarly, *Goiffon* fails to disclose a method that includes “obtaining, based at least in part on the user-specified level of expansion and the credential associated with the user and the role associated with the user, one or more expanded search terms,” as recited by claim 1. Claims 6, 11, 17, 21, and 28 each recite a similar limitation.

Goiffon discloses a method allowing a user to control the development of a concept-based natural language search query by controlling the manner in which a hierarchical concept tree is structured and traversed. *Goiffon*, 1:18-25. In other words, *Goiffon* discloses a system where users can expand a word-search with additional related terms selected from a hierarchy. One of the passages cited by the Examiner is illustrative:

FIG. 4 is an exemplary screen provided by Search String Wizard (SSW) 121 to users to obtain the search string and other optional parameters required to initiate development of a search query. The user provides the initial search string in Box 400. In this example, assume the user provides the term "Bugs". The user further selects the levels of hierarchy within the hierarchical concept tree in one or more Application Domains that will be utilized to develop the search. This is accomplished by specifying whether parent, sibling, or child concepts will be included for any located concepts. These parameters are specified in Boxes 402, 404, and 406, respectively. If parent and/or child concepts are to be included, the number of levels of hierarchy to be traversed during the search development may be specified in Boxes 408 and 410. A default value of "one" is assumed if no value is provided.

Goiffon, 14:45-59. While *Goiffon* does disclose that a search may be expanded based on additional terms selected by a user from the three hierarchy (e.g., the “parent” child”

or “sibling” concepts), *Goiffon* does not disclose a method that includes obtaining one or more expanded search terms, based on “a credential associated with the user and a role associated with the user. The Examiner suggests that *Goiffon* discloses these limitations at Col. 25 line 60 to Col. 26 line 5. Respectfully, Applicants disagree.

The passage cited by the Examiner is, in fact, directed to how terms in an “Application Domain” may be changed by authorized users. Set out in full, the passage provides as follows:

In one embodiment of the current invention, the above-described functions related to creating and modifying elements are based on user privilege levels as related to particular application domains. This allows system administrators to determine which users are allowed to make modifications to the Element Inventory 102, and further provides control over which portions of the Application Domain are modified. This protection is provided by only allowing designated users to execute the “Get Element For Update” function shown in FIG. 13, and by further verifying that the Application Domain element associated with the user-specified element is one of the Application Domains that may be processed for that user.

Goiffon, 25:60-67, 26:1-5. As disclosed in *Goiffon*, the “Application Domain” provides a “hierarchical concept tree stored in memory [used to] to develop a query. The nodes of the concept tree, which are grouped according to broad application areas called Application Domains, represent concepts that might describe any given search topic.” *Goiffon*, 4:1-6. More simply, the “Application Domain” specifies a collection of related terms. The passage cited by the Examiner refers to how users may manage what particular terms are specified by a given “Application Domain.” For example, *Goiffon*, Figure 5 includes a list of word and word variants for the term “BUG” as including “BUGS” and “BUG’S” and also includes a list of concepts related to this term of “VW BEETLE,” “INSECT,” and “SOFTWARE PROBLEM.” The passage cited by the Examiner is related to limiting what users may change or modify, by adding and/or removing, elements from these lists of “terms” and “concepts.”

Applicants submit that the disclosure in *Goiffon* – that only certain users may be “allowed to make modifications to the element inventory 102, and further provides control over which portions of the Application domain are modified”—simply fails to

disclose a method for context-sensitive searching of fields of a data repository using multiple levels of term expansion” that includes “obtaining one or more parameters associated with the base search term,” where the one or more parameters include “at least a credential associated with the user and a role associated with the user,” and “obtaining, based ... on the credential associated with the user and the role associated with the user one or more expanded search terms,” as recited by claim 1. Claims 6, 11, and 28 each recite a corresponding limitation.

For all the foregoing reasons, therefore, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 6, 11, and 28 are allowable and respectfully request allowance of the same. Additionally, claims 2-4, 7, 9-10, 14-16 and 29-30 each depend from one of claims 1, 6, 11, or 28. Accordingly, Applicants submit that these dependent claims are allowable and respectfully request allowance of the same.

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted, and
S-signed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4,

/Gero G. McClellan, Reg. No. 44,227/

Gero G. McClellan
Registration No. 44,227
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant(s)